UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/767,728	01/30/2004	Michael Shenfield	T8467911US	6100

26912   7590   07/08/2009
GOWLING LAFLEUR HENDERSON LLP
SUITE 1600, 1 FIRST CANADIAN PLACE
100 KING STREET WEST
TORONTO, ON M5X 1G5
CANADA

EXAMINER
HOANG, PHUONG N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2194	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/08/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 January 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1 - 42* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1 - 42* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *01/19/09*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1 – 42 are pending for examination. This office action is in response to amendment filed on 01/06/2009.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3.   **Claims 1 – 7, 12 - 14, 19 – 27, 32 - 34, 39 - 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Slaughter, US patent no. 7,458,082.**

4.   **As to claim 1**, Slaughter teaches a method for providing dynamic interaction between a pair of application programs by a interface module of a terminal (API layer sits on top of message layer, col. 11 lines 5 – 40, col. 78 lines 57- 30, col. 83 lines 5 – 30, col. 14 lines 37 - 50), the pair of applications including a requestor application desiring access to a target application, the method comprising the steps of:

Registering (registering, col. 45 lines 35 – 45, col. 47 lines 40 - 50) access

information of the target application, the access information including published access

information (advertisement, col. 60 lines 20 - 30) made available in a data structure for

retrieval by the interface module (API layer in space service, col. 60 lines 20 - 30);

receiving an access request by the interface module (message layer, col. 11

lines 5 – 40) from the requester application (client application, col. 11 lines 10 – 40), the

access request including request content corresponding to the published access

information of the target application (clients posting services, col. 11 lines 5 – 40);

obtaining an interface component (API layer, col. 11 lines 25 – 40) by using the

request content to search the data structure (directory service …search facility, col. 13

lines 16 - 40), the interface component (messaging layer, col. 11 lines 25 - 40, col. 12

lines 40 – 60, col. 13 lines 57 – col. 14 lines 20) configured for enabling communication

between the interface module and the target application in an access format expected

by the target application (col. 13 lines 40 -55); and

employing (inherent) the interface component by the interface module to satisfy

the access request of the requestor application for interaction with the target application.

5.   **As to claim 2**, Slaughter teaches wherein the interface component includes an

application program interface (API layer, col. 11 lines 25 – 40) configured for

communication in a language incompatible with the interface module (platform

independence, col. 13 lines 40 – 55, col. col. 14 lines 6 - 20).

6.   **As to claim 3**, Slaughter teaches wherein the incompatible language is that used

by a native runtime environment of the terminal (PDAs, mobile phones, col. 14 lines 36 -

45).

7.   **As to claim 4**, Slaughter teaches wherein the interface component includes an

application program interface (API) configured for communication in a language

compatible with the interface module (API layer, col. 11 lines 5 – 40).

8.   **As to claim 5**, Slaughter wherein the interface component further includes an

access handler configured for providing translation between the interface module and

the application program interface (proxies…translate messages, col. 7 lines 50 - 60).

9.   **As to claim 6**, Slaughter teaches registering the access handler with the

interface module through an extension interface, the published access information of

the access handler being added to the data structure (register, col. 41 lines 40 – 50, col.

42 lines 4 – 12, col. 48 lines 1 - 10).

10.   **As to claim 7**, Slaughter teaches accessing the target application through the interface module using the access handler to call a corresponding application program interface (proxies, col. 7 lines 35 - 60).

11.   **As to claim 12**, Slaughter teaches assembling the request content to include selected from the group comprising: a local location and a remote location (local and remote, figure 38 and associated text, col. 12 lines 40 - 50).

12.   **As to claims 13 - 14**, Slaughter teaches wherein the remote location is on other terminal coupled to said terminal through a network, the other terminal having one of the pair of applications for network interaction with the other of the pair of applications (network layer, col. 12 lines 15 - 50).

13.   **As to claims 19 - 20**, Slaughter teaches providing an interface of the platform neutral interface selected from the group comprising: an extension interface, a query and registration interface, and an execution interface (col. 12 lines 40 – 50, col. 14 lines 10 - 15).

14.   **As to claim 21**, this is the system claim of claim 1. See rejection for claim 1

above.

15.   **As to claims 22 – 27**, see rejection for claims 2 – 7 above.

16.   **As to claims 32 – 34**, see rejection for claims 12 - 14 above.

17.   **As to claims 39 - 40**, see rejection for claims 19 – 20 above.

18.   **As to claim 41**, Slaughter teaches wherein the query and registration interface is

configured for publishing the access information (publish messages, col. 19 lines 5 -

15).

19.   **As to claim 42**, this is the memory claim of claim 1. See rejection for claim 1

above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

20.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

21.   **Claims 8 –   10 and 28 - 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over Slaughter, US patent no. 7,458,082.

22.   **As to claim 8**, Slaughter does not explicitly teach employing a search algorithm

with the request content for identifying matching ones of the access handlers for use by

the interface module. However, Slaughter teaches search algorithm (directory service

…search facility, col. 13 lines 16 - 40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to recognize that the search facility can apply to search all types of

information including proxies to quickly retrieve and access the service.

23.   **As to claims 9 - 10**, Slaughter teaches wherein the language used to express

the interface module is selected from the group comprising; a structured definition

language based on xml and a script (xml, col. 12 lines 60 - 65).

24. **As to claims 28 - 30**, see rejection for claims 8 - 10 above.

25. **Claims 15 – 18, 35 - 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slaughter, US patent no. 7,458,082 in view of Weschler, US patent no. 6,920,455.**

26. **As to claim 15**, Slaughter does not explicitly teach wherein the data structure is selected from the group comprising an application profile table and an application API descriptor table.

Weschler teaches the step of the data structure is selected from the group comprising an application profile table and an application API descriptor table (profile data store and profile services API, figures 2 and 3 and associated text).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Slaughter and Weschler because Weschler's profile data store would provide an interface that enable a client application having a corresponding interface to send messages and providing management utilities for defining schemas (col. 7 lines 45 – 55).

27.   **As to claim 16**, Weschler teaches wherein the application profile table includes application profiles of a plurality of target applications (figures and 2 and 3 and associated text).

28.   **As to claim 17**, Weschler teaches wherein the application API descriptor table includes descriptors selected from the group comprising: API descriptors and extension element descriptors (col. 10 lines 10 – 20, table 1 of col. 11).

29.   **As to claim 18**, Slaughter modified by Weschler teaches wherein the data structure includes the access information selected from the group comprising; application URI, application version, application description, and a predefined set of matching API construct pairs (Slaughter; URL, col. 12 lines 60 - 67).

30.   **As to claims 35 – 38**, see rejection for claims 15 - 18 above.

31.   **Claims 11 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slaughter, US patent no. 7,458,082 in view of Bloch, US pub. no. 2002/0129129.**

32.   Bloch reference was cited in previous office action.

33.   **As to claims 11 and 31**, Slaughter does not explicitly teach wherein the

language used to express the script is ECMA script.

Bloch teaches ECMA script (ECMA script, figures 4 and 8 and associated text,

especially 0062, 0064, 0086).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the teachings of Slaughter and Block's system because

ECMA script would provide a free-form script text that must be parsed by a specific

script engine compliant with ECMA format as designed for the system.

Response to Arguments

34.   Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new

ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

35.   The prior art made of record but not relied upon request is considered to be

pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Robertson, US patent no. 7,401,131, demonstrating a method for implementing

improved containers in a global ecosystem of interrelated services.

Kitada, US pub. no. 2003/0217095, demonstrating a method for documents with

multiple applications.

36.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

37.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to PHUONG N. HOANG whose telephone number is

(571)272-3763. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00 am to

5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Hyunh S. Sough can be reached on 571-272-6799. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Hyung S. SOUGH/   /P. N. H./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2194   Examiner, Art Unit 2194
07/06/09